DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 061 EA 013 516

AUTHOR Jackson, Shirley: Drennan, Ann
TITLE USOE Steering Committee for Basic Skills Coordination. Annual Report: FY '79 Activities: FY 1980 Plan.
INSTITUTION Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 80
NOTE 60p.: Occasional pages may be marginally legible.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Activities: *Basic Skills: *Coordination: Elementary Secondary Education: *Federal Programs: Objectives
IDENTIFIERS *Department of Education

ABSTRACT

In 1979, the Education Department's steering committee for basic skills coordination worked toward institutionalizing the coordination of basic skills programs at the federal level. This report discusses the committee's objectives and activities during that year in the areas of communication, regulations, organization, monitoring, technical assistance, research (case studies), individual program plans, and assessment. An outline and matrix of problems in basic skills coordination and plans for the committee's activities in 1980 are appended. (WD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED201061

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ANNUAL REPORT

USOE STEERING COMMITTEE

FOR

BASIC SKILLS COORDINATION

FY 1979

Shirley Jackson, Chairperson

Ann Drennan, Consultant

January, 1980

EA 013 516

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The ED Steering Committee for Basic skills Coordination has completed its Phase Four. In FY 1979 it was actively engaged in tasks aimed at institutionalizing the coordination of basic skills program components at the Federal level. Institutionalization at the Federal level is seen as a necessary precursor to the facilitation of coordination of basic skills programs at the State, local, and instructional building level. Twenty-six Education Department offices and Head Start hold membership on the Steering Committee.

At the beginning of FY'79 the driving force in the office for basic skills coordination, was an administrative Commissioner's Initiative, which then gained a legislative mandate (P.L. 95-561, Title II, Sec. 210), and subsequently a Commissioner's Directive. The FY'79 activities of the OE Steering Committee for Basic Skills Coordination were based upon the responsibilities outlined in that Directive.

The activities of the Steering Committee can be categorized as:

I. Communication Activities

- A. A comparison of legislation concerned with basic skills
- B. Dissemination to the field
- C. Bulletins to OE staff on basic skills coordination
- D. An internal communication or information center for OE
- E. Two seminars for OE staff
- F. A review of Education Division technical assistance and dissemination activities
- G. An information series for OE
- H. The development of a Basic Skills Forum

II. Regulations Activities

Meetings with the Offices of General Counsel, Policy Studies, Regulations Management, and Educational Programs to clarify the coordination language in the Education Division General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR)

III. Organizational Activities

- A. The development of objectives of the Steering Committee for the Major Initiative Tracking System (MITS)
- B. Work with the Deputy Commissioners to watch closely the develop and continuation of program coordination of basic skills components

IV. Monitoring Activities

A two-day fact-finding trip to the Maryland State Department of Education and the Baltimore City Schools to determine needed Federal supportive structures to aid basic skills coordination at State and local levels

V. Technical Assistance Activities

These activities were not developed.

VI. Case Studies

Two case studies were developed:

A. Teacher Corps Pilot Cluster in Basic Skills Coordination

B. A study of the coordination of educational and other services for handicapped children in Louisiana

VII. Individual Program Plans

Eleven of the twenty-five offices holding membership on the Steering Committee developed individual program plans for basic skills coordination in FY'79.

Assessment

A chronology was developed of the history of this most recent basic skills coordination effort in the Education Division, as a first step in assessment of the activities of the Steering Committee for Basic Skills Coordination.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Executive Summary.....i

1979 Working Representatives

by Program Management Representatives.....1

by Bureau and Program.....3

I. Communication Activities.....5

A. Comparison of Laws.....5
Analysis of Legislation.....6

B. Dissemination Through Newsletter.....5

C. Bulletins to ED Staff.....5

D. Communication Center.....5

E. Staff Seminar.....7

F. Review of Technical Assistance.....8

G. Information Series.....8

H. Basic Skills Forum.....8

II. Regulations Activities.....9

EDGAR Coordination Language.....10

III. Organizational Activities.....11

A. MITS.....11

B. Deputy Commissioners.....11

IV. Monitoring Activities.....12

V. Technical Assistance Activities.....12

VI. Case Studies.....12

VII. Individual Program Coordination Plans.....14

Assessment.....14

Program Representation at Meetings.....15

Final Budget.....16

Other Materials Available Upon Request.....17

1979 WORKING REPRESENTATIVES BY PROGRAM

PROGRAM	1st Appt.	2nd Appt.	3rd Appt.	Substitute for Special Events
Libraries	M. McNeely	P. deButts		M. Jones
Migrants	P. Hogan			W. Steidle
NDN	H. DeVanney			
NIE	T. Sticht	S. Robinson	E. Esty J. Dominic R. Selden G. Cutlip	
Teacher Centers	A. Schmieder R. Pearman			C. Bialek
Teacher Corps	G. Austin A. Jackson			
Title I	P. Miller M.J. LeTendre P. Perry			
Title IV-C	R. Thomas			G. Stember
TRIO	D. Johnson	V.M. Williams	B. Freeman	
Vocational Ed.	J. Fowlkes	B. Kemp		W. Young
BESE	J. Griffin	A. Koga		
Adult Education	J. Mark			
Arts & Humanities	J. Ancarrow	S. Balkcom		
Right to Read/ Basic Skills	S. Jackson R. Bell J. Kerns A. Drennan			
Bilingual Education	F. Delia	E. Keesee		M. Pratt
Career Education	G. Elbers	S.R. Funk		
ESAA	P. Miller	S. Price		

Evaluation	E. Glassman E. Rattner			
Follow Through	R. Koury			
General Counsel	S. Winnick	J. Kristy		
Gifted & Talented	M. Bokee			
Grants & Contracts	K. Blaydes	N. Audi		
Handicapped	M. Bokee	G. Lambour		
Head Start	R. Collins J. Klein			S. Peckman B. Schmalzreid
Indian Education	J. Sam K. Hunter			S. Wederath
Institutional Devel.	B. Retzlaff			

1979 MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATIVES BY BUREAU AND PROGRAM

Commissioner (Executive Deputy & Deputy)	Bureau
John Ellis	Exec. Dep. Commissioner for Educational Programs
James Pickman	Exec. Dep. Commissioner for Resources & Operations
Daniel Dunham	Occupational & Adult Education
Gerald Gipp	Indian Education
Edwin Martin	Education for the Handicapped
Floretta McKenzie	School Improvement
Thomas Minter	Elementary & Secondary Education
Alfred Moye'	Higher & Continuing Education
Herschel Saucier	Acting Commissioner, Children Youth & Families
Michael Timpane	Acting Director, NIE

Program Manager	Program
Harold Arberg	Arts and Humanities
Judy Baker	Indian Education
Ted Skye	General Counsel
Edward Brantley	Institutional Development
Paul Delker	Adult Education
John Evans	Evaluation & Dissemination
Richard Fairley	Education for the Disadvantaged
Josue' Gonzalez	Bilingual Education
Dick Hays	Libraries & Learning Resources
Kenneth Hoyt	Career Education
Shirley Jackson	Basic Skills

Program Manager (continued)	Program (continued)
Dave Johnson	Student Services & Veterans Programs
Milbrey Jones	School Libraries
Harold Lyon	Gifted and Talented
Thaine McCormick	Vocational Education
George Rhodes	Emergency School Aid
Vidal Rivera	Migrant Education
Allen Schmieder	Teacher Centers
William Smith	Teacher Corps
Alpheus White	State Assistance
Lee Wickline	Educational Replication
Fred Will	Grant & Procurement Management
Rosemary Wilson	Follow Through

FY 1979

A Summary of the Accomplishments

of

The O.E. Steering Committee for

Basic Skills Coordination

I. COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES

A. A comparison of the laws administered by OE which involve basic skills was to be developed by the Steering Committee staff by April 30, 1979. It was completed September 7, 1979.

After the regulations are in final form, a similar comparison will be developed, reviewed, and made available. The regulations of 13 of the 22 member programs were not final at the end of fiscal year 1979.

B. Information about the Steering Committee activities was to be offered regularly to dissemination and diffusion newsletters. This activity has been minimally implemented by working with the dissemination activities of the Far West Lab's Washington office. This activity needs to be expanded.

C. One page bulletins were to be sent to the program officers of member programs. Some progress has been made on this activity:

(1) The names, addresses and phone numbers, areas of specialization, and geographic assignments of 504 program officers of the member programs have been collected.

(2) Labels have been computerized in FOB#6. However, this activity has been held up because there were many inaccuracies in the labels and a shortage of manpower in FOB#6 to correct the computer.

D. A communication center was to be developed to make a variety of information available to OE program officers. A small contract was let to the Far West Lab to design an internally-run Information Center on Basic Skills Coordination for the use of the Department of Education staff.

The plan envisioned for the clearinghouse/brokerage is one which will have the goals of:

(1) Allowing timely access to, while avoiding duplication with, existing networks and information sources for the basic skills in the Department of Education or elsewhere.

* ANALYSIS OF LEGISLATION GOVERNING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS CONCERNED WITH BASIC SKILLS

Specific Requirements Under the Legislation

PROGRAMS	Coordination Required in Legis	Local	State	Federal	Basic Skills	Staff Development	Preservice	Inservice	Testing and Needs Assessments	Evaluation	Dissemination	Technical Assistance	Research & Demonstration	Materials Development	Print	Media	Advisory Councils/Committees	Local	State	Federal	Parent/Community Training	Counseling	Desegregation Assistance	Nonpublic Schools	State Formula	Discretionary	LEA	IHE	Other	Target Population	Low Achievers	Econ. Disadvantaged	Limited English	Handicapped	Indian	Pre-school	Elementary	Secondary	Post-Secondary	Professionals	Sole Clients
ESEA Title I	X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X				X		X		X			X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Title I Migratory Children	X	X		X			X	X	X			X				X	X	X		X	X			X	X	X	X												
Title II Basic Skills	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X		X			X	X	X	X	X		X						X	X	X		
Title IV C	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X			
Title IV B		X									X	X						X					X	X	X				X	X	X				X	X			
Title VI ESAA				X			X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X			
Title VII Bilingual	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X		
Indian Education	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X		X	X		X		X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X		
Title XIII Adult Ed.	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X					X		
Head Start				X	X		X		X	X	X	X													X	X		X		X			X	X	X					
Follow Through		X			X		X		X		X	X						X						X	X		X		X						X				
Title IX Gifted & Tal.		X			X		X	X	X	X	X	X											X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			
HEA Title IV TRIO				X	X		X			X	X										X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X				X	X		
Teacher Corps		X		X	X		X		X	X	X	X					X								X	X	X		X										X	
Teacher Centers		X	X	X			X	X		X	X	X					X				X				X	X	X												X	
Education of all Handicapped Children	X	X			X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X			X				X		X	X	X	X	X					X	X	X	X	X	X		
Career Education	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X					X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X								X	X	X		
Vocational Education	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X			X	X		
Evaluation									X		X																		X											
NDN								X	X	X	X	X																													
HEA III Strengthening Development Insti.								X		X				X						X						X						X		X				X		
Arts and Humanities												X	X															X									X			
ESEA III																																								

This chart was taken from The Comparison of Legislation.

(2) Filling in the gaps through limited collection building in the areas of basic skills and of coordination.

(3) Developing necessary technical assistance/training materials to aid Federal professional staff in facilitating true program coordination at all levels of education within the constraints of the varying legislation and regulations.

The Tasks of the Far West Lab Contract

Develop an operating plan for a clearinghouse/brokerage which includes:

(1) Economical strategies (in terms of money and staff time) for gaining access to existing information sources.

(2) A collection of basic skills teaching/learning information (materials, processes, and resource people) within and without the Department of Education.

(a) of interest to Department of Education staff and
(b) not readily available from No. 1 above:

(3) A collection of information on coordination of programs at all levels of education

(a) of interest to Department of Education staff and
(b) not readily available from No. 1 above.

(4) Strategies for gaining access to professional staff within and outside of Department of Education with similar assignments in different programs (the similarity might be the area of specialization, geographic assignments, etc.).

(5) The preparation of special materials to aid the Department of Education program officers and managers in working with State departments of education and local education agencies in the coordination of basic skills programs.

One option that will be explored is putting all the information on computer (1) for quick retrieval and (2) to aid in keeping it current.

E. A staff seminar was to be mounted for OE program officers. Actually, two identical two-day seminars were held which involved 125 program officers. These seminars were held in September because funds were not made available to the Steering Committee until the end of July. Twenty-four percent of those program officers who were invited from member programs were able to attend around end-of-the-fiscal-year duties and travel. In addition, the seminars were available to six USOE regional offices by telephone and to four regional offices on tape. The goals of the seminar were to be:

(1) to develop a dialogue across programs. This goal was met to some degree.

(2) to gain (a) information about the basic skills components and (b) the possibilities for coordination across OE programs. While some of the small group sessions paid a lot of attention to basic skills components, coordination possibilities were thoroughly discussed in all eighteen small groups. Those discussions have been summarized.

The OE program officers in attendance were supportive and resourceful in considering program coordination of basic skills components.

(3) to develop recommendations for the FY'80 Plan. The small group summary was helpful in drafting the 1980 Plan.

F. Current dissemination and Technical Assistance efforts were to be explored. The June meeting was devoted to learning about existing basic skills-related dissemination and technical assistance resources within HEW.

1. The following people reported on their efforts at the June meeting:

John Evans, Joint Dissemination Review Panel
Lee Wickline, National Diffusion Network
Joseph Schneider, Council for Educational Development & Research
William McLaughlin, Regional Liaison Office
Maure Hurt, Interagency Panel on Children, Youth & Adults
Fred Rosenau, Far West Educational Lab
Ed Ellis, NIE Regional Programs
Charles Hoover, ERIC
Ann Bezdek, Evaluation

This session was taped and transcribed in June. These presentations were repeated at both September seminars.

2. Planning for increased utility of these units by OE program officers in their work in the field, particularly with teachers, is scheduled to be accomplished through the clearinghouse plan.

G. An information series on specific OE programs was to be explored.

This activity has been discussed briefly, but positively, with the Horace Mann Learning Center, but has not yet been implemented. It has been included in the 1980 Plan.

H. A Basic Skills Forum of individuals knowledgeable in basic skills coordination was to be developed. Some of the member programs have offered the names of resource people, but this activity is still in its developmental stages andd will continue through 1980.

II. REGULATIONS ACTIVITIES

A problem that Steering Committee members isolated early in their deliberations was that the coordination mandate in their different pieces of legislation never went in two directions. Whether the mandated coordinating program was to be at the Federal, State, local or instructional building level, the coordinatee program was not required in turn to coordinate by its legislation. Therefore, coordination was not in the job descriptions, regulations, guidelines, or generally in coordinatee programs.

May and June, 1979, there were five meetings of staff from the (1) Office of General Counsel (2) Policy Studies, (3) Division of Regulations Management, (4) Office of the Executive Deputy Commissioner for Educational Programs, and (5) Steering Committee for Basic Skills Coordination.

Three alternatives were open to the group in resolving the one-way problem in coordination.

1. To revise the regulations of all twenty programs toward common coordination language;

2. To go to new rule-making; and/or

3. To further develop the EDGAR coordination language for 100a.(discretionary programs) and 100b.(State formula programs).

The first alternative was the strongest, and serious consideration was given to it; but since thirteen of the programs regulations were at the end of their comment periods, it was believed that the time involved in amending those and the other seven regulations (probably at least a year) would seriously undermine the momentum toward coordination.

The second alternative was so seriously considered that the Office of General Counsel drew up the language for new rulemaking. The new rule would have required evidence (a) of a move toward coordination in all applications for them to be considered for funding; and (b) of coordination in required reports. It was only in the fifth meeting of the group that it was decided that this strategy too would be too costly in terms of time delay.

The third alternative was therefore adopted. This alternative required special attention to program coordination of funded discretionary and State formula programs containing a basic skills component.

Even the third alternative developed a rocky history. In July a member of the EDGAR Task Force objected to the amended coordination language and further meetings were held. It was decided to go with the June decisions. In August a staff member from the Office of General Counsel (OGC) deleted the amended coordination language from EDGAR (not one of the

three attorneys originally involved in the June decision.) One of the original OGC staff members got together with his colleague and arranged to have the amendment stand. In September it was discovered that during the August contretemps the amended definition of coordination (100a & b.581) had been accidentally omitted. It was restored. However, September also saw the vote for a new Department of Education. This combined with several months without a Commissioner; a new Secretary; the new Senior Executive Service Training which took the attention of the OE managers; the reorganization for PL 95-561; and the further promised reorganization for the new Department interrupted the smooth development of regulations—including EDGAR. At the end of the fiscal year, it was not known when/if EDGAR would be in force. The final EDGAR coordination language follows:

COORDINATION

§100a.580 and 100b.580 Coordination with other activities

(a) A grantee (100a.)/A State and a subgrantee (100b.) shall, to the extent possible, coordinate its project (s) with other activities that are in the same geographic area served by the project and that serve similar purposes and target groups.

(b) A grantee (100a.)/A State and a subgrantee (100b.) whose project includes activities to improve the basic skills of children, youth, or adults shall, to the extent possible, coordinate its project with other basic skills activities that are in the same geographic area served by the project.

(c) For the purposes of this section, "basic skills" means reading, mathematics, and effective communication, both written and oral.

(d) The grantee (100a.)/The State or subgrantee (100b.) shall continue its coordination during the project period (100a.)/during the period that it carries out the project (100b.)
(20 U.S.C. 1221e-3(a)(1))

§100a.581 Methods of coordination.

Depending on the objectives and requirements of its project (100a.)/a project (100b.), a grantee shall use one or more of the following methods of coordination:

(a) Planning the project with organizations and individuals who have similar objectives or concerns.

(b) Sharing information, facilities, staff, services, or other resources.

(c) Engaging in joint activities such as instruction, needs assessment, evaluation, monitoring, and technical assistance or staff training.

(d) Using the grant funds so as not to duplicate or counteract the effects of funds made available under other programs.

(e) Using the grant funds to increase the impact of funds made available under other programs.

(20 U.S.C. 1221e-3(a)(1))

III. ORGANIZATIONAL ACTIVITIES

A. The Steering Committee requested that Major Initiative Tracking System (MITS) concerning basic skills coordination be developed for programs with coordination language in their legislation and/or with formal coordination plans and for the target programs of that legislated or planned coordination. This was not accomplished. The issue was the method of evaluation for the MITS. Management desired to measure the MITS by pupil achievement. Steering Committee representatives took the position that this type of measurement was premature; that the exact nature of the relationship between coordination of Federal, State, and local basic skills programs and pupil achievement is an unknown which needs study. It might be more reasonable initially to study: (a) cost effectiveness of coordinated activities over a three-year period. Start-up costs of coordination are known to be high in terms of staff time. However, over time there is a definite saving. Louisiana, for example, now past the initial heavy schedule of interagency meetings to develop interagency agreements, realizes a $46 million annual saving from coordination of services to handicapped children.
(b) who gets served for what needs? Often real problems of learners are ignored or inappropriately addressed without coordinated programs. At one extreme might be the handicapped or the Indian child who cannot get help in basic skills from Title I or other programs because monies targeted for his/her primary need get in the way. At the other extreme is the child with multi-eligibilities who is repeatedly pulled out for multiple (and uncoordinated) basic skills classes. How adjustments in these matters affect these students' achievement may not be the first question, but one that should be asked in 1982-3.

B. The Steering Committee also asked the Deputy Commissioners to assume responsibility for spotchecking the continuation of coordination activities in their bureaus. The deputy commissioners have been very supportive of the Steering Committee. While there have been no formal written communications of routine checks of progress toward coordination of basic skills components from the offices of the deputy commissioners, there have been informal updates and presentations at Steering Committee events.

IV. MONITORING ACTIVITIES

The concept of a State program review or monitoring visit was redefined as a fact-finding trip after it was realized that standards for coordination of State and local basic skills programs were not firmly enough in place to warrant the term "monitoring" for the projected trip.

A fact-finding trip to Maryland occurred September 20th and 21st, 1979. Nineteen of the twenty-five units comprising the Steering Committee were represented although some programs sent substitutes for the regular working representatives. The first day, the Maryland Basic Skills Task Force met with the Steering Committee. The second day, the Baltimore City Schools administration met in force with the Steering Committee. The reports from these two meetings are available.
C. The purpose of the trip was to gather information on needed Federal supportive structures to aid basic skills program coordination at the State and local levels.

V. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES

The Commissioner's Directive and the 1979 Plan said "appropriate representatives of member programs will provide technical assistance in teams to SEAs and LEAs which request aid in basic skills coordination." No technical assistance activities of this description occurred. In fact, this was the one activity mandated for the Steering Committee that raised objection during the small group discussions of OE program officers in September. In the view of the considerable number of OE program officers questioning this activity, they and their colleagues should be responsible for technical assistance concerning coordination to the States and projects assigned to them. However, they recommended most strongly that there was a role in technical assistance for the Steering Committee--that of aiding the program officers in developing and maintaining their ability to give adequate TA in coordination. They saw the need for (a) models of coordination, (b) a handbook on coordination, and (c) a central information source to handle specific questions about coordination of basic skills programs.

VI. CASE STUDIES

Two case studies were done to discover the state of the art in coordination. One was done by the Teacher Corps; the other by Steering Committee staff.

The Teacher Corps studied in-service training at all of its sites to determine which ones dealt with basic skills and how much coordination existed at those sites. A synopsis of that case study is available.

The Steering Committee consultant went as a member of the Institute for Educational Leadership Special Education Field Seminar to Louisiana to

study interagency coordination for services to the handicapped. There were opportunities to study both the State and local levels of administration and practice.

Several lessons can be learned from the Louisiana experience:

1. It may help if State law backs up Federal law, as is the case in Louisiana. State law says that the SEA must monitor and give technical assistance to other State agencies in the area of services to the handicapped, which may give the SEA the necessary clout to get the work done.

2. There need to be standards for services clearly delineated by each coordinating agency before attempts at coordination go very far.

3. Hard facts need to be collected on the actual services of the coordinating agencies--How many of whom are served? By whom? Where? At what cost? etc.

4. The staffs of all coordinating agencies need to be fully cognizant of the standards, full range of services, and staff responsibilities for coordination to take place. This means staff development and a communication network.

5. The management of the coordinating agencies must have trust in their staffs to represent them in day-to-day interagency matters.

6. The start-up for interagency agreements/coordination is demanding of time and anxiety-producing. Misunderstandings and disagreements are diminished if clear standards for service and hard facts about services exist.

7. Interagency agreements and practices may be easier to accomplish than intra-agency coordination. In Louisiana, Vocational Rehabilitation and Special Education are operating in each other's pocket, but Vocational Education (a fellow SEA program) apparently is not actively implementing the existing Special Education - Vocational Education interagency agreement. It may be concluded that handicapped children and youth generally were not receiving their entitlements under Federal education legislation other than Education for All Handicapped Children in Louisiana.

8. Often LEAs and school buildings are coordinating programs because they feel they can give better educational services in this fashion, but feel that they may be doing so surreptitiously because the Federal and State levels do not have their acts together in terms of program coordination.

VII. INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM COORDINATION PLANS

The following programs developed specific coordination plans in relation to their membership on the Steering Committee.

COORDINATORS	COORDINATEES
Adult Education	Title I Basic Skills (Already coordinating with CETA)
Arts and Humanities	Not specific
Career Education	Title I Teacher Corps Teacher Centers Follow Through Head Start Bilingual Education
Follow Through	Head Start Title I Bilingual Education Teacher Corps Teacher Centers Handicapped
Gifted & Talented	Title IV-C
Indian Education	Title I Title IV, A
Libraries (Title IV-B)	Title IV-C Basic Skills Career Education
National Diffusion Network	Not specific
Teacher Centers	Basic Skills
Teacher Corps	Basic Skills
Title I	Basic Skills Title IV-C National Diffusion Network

The first annual coordination reports from Teacher Corps and Title I are available.

ASSESSMENT

A chronicle of events in the development of basic skills coordination is being written. It is planned to let a small contract in FY'80 for a formal assesment of Steering Committee progress.

Program Representation at Steering
Committee Monthly Meetings
and Other Events, FY 1979

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept Sem.	MD Trip
Adult Education	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Arts & Humanities							X			
Bilingual Education			X		X	X			X	X
Career Education	X	X			X	X			X	
ESAA									X	
Evaluation	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Follow Through	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
General Counsel					X		X			
Gifted & Talented							X	X	X	X
Contracts & Grants					X					X
Handicapped	X	X			X	X		X	X	X
Head Start				X					X	
Indian Education	X						X	X		X
Institutional Devel.						X	X		X	X
Libraries	X	X		X		X	X	X		X
Migrants				X		X				X
NDN		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
NIE	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X
Right to Read	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Teacher Centers				X		X		X	X	X
Teacher Corps			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Title I	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Title IV C			X	X	X			X	X	X
TRIO	X	X		X						X
Vocational Ed.	X	X		X	X				X	X

FINAL BUDGET

1.	Technical Assistance	$ -
2.	State program review by Office of Education Basic Skills Steering Committee members to Maryland SEA and Baltimore LEA.	$2,500
3.	Printing and reproduction	(see seminars)
4.	Clearinghouse - Communications Design and Operations	$10,000
5.	OE Seminars on Basic SKills Coordination (for OE program officers) Conference help and materials.	$9,900
6.	Assessment design	$ -
	TOTAL	$22,400

OTHER 1979 MATERIALS CONCERNING STEERING COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST

A. Program of September, 1979, Seminars on Basic Skills Coordination

- Compilation of 18 Small Group Reports
- Part I: Suggestions for Developing Basic Skills Coordination
- Part II: Exemplary Sites
- Part III: Problems/Misunderstandings that Might Block Basic Skills Coordination

B. Report from Maryland SEA on Needed Federal Support for Basic Skills Coordination

C. Report from Baltimore Visit on Needed State and Federal Support for Basic Skills

D. Teacher Corps 1979 Annual Basic Skills Coordination Report

E. Title I 1979 Annual Basic Skills Coordination Report

F. Comparison of Legislation

O.E. STEERING COMMITTEE

FOR BASIC SKILLS COORDINATION

April 12, 1979

FY '79 ACTIVITIES

Shirley Jackson
Chairperson

Ann Drennan, Consultant
Room 1167, Donohoe
245-8242

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DATES..... 1

GOALS..... 2

RESPONSIBILITIES..... 2

OBJECTIVES..... 3

PLANNERS..... 4

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS..... 4

PLANS..... 5

1. COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES..... 5

A. Comparison of Laws..... 5

B. Dissemination Newsletters..... 5

C. One-Page Bulletins to Program Officers..... 5

D. Communication Center..... 5

E. Staff Seminar..... 6

F. Meeting on Dissemination Resources..... 6

G. Information Series..... 7

H. Basic Skills Forum..... 7

I. Materials for Steering Committee Members..... 8

II. REGULATIONS ACTIVITIES..... 8

A. Time Lines for Regulations..... 8

B. Coordination Language in Regulations..... 8

III. ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES..... 8

A. MITS Across Programs..... 9

B. Deputy Commissioners Spot Check..... 9

IV . MONITORING ACTIVITIES 9

V . TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES 9

VI . CASE STUDIES 10

VII. INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM COORDINATING PLANS 10

ASSESSMENT 11

BUDGET 11

APPENDICES:

A. Problems Requiring Coordination: Reasons to Coordinate... 15
Problems Concerning Coordination: Constraints to Coordination 17
Chart 20

January	Steering Committee for Basic Skills Coordination started meeting monthly
February	All program managers and deputy Commissioners individually discussed 5th draft of commissioners Directive
March	Constraints to coordination defined
April	1979 plan completed
May	Chief State School Officers signed preamble to agreement for comprehensive educational planning and programming in the basic skills in their States (48 States, 7 Territories)
June	Commissioner Boyer signed Directive defining responsibilities of Steering Committee for Basic Skills Coordination Regulations, General Counsel, Policy, Educational Programs, and Steering Committee agree on clarification of coordination language in EDGAR
July	Acting Commissioner Berry appointed program managers and deputy commissioners to Steering Committee. NIE and Head Start also included
September	OE professional staff seminars (two) on basic skills coordination
	Steering Committee to travel to Maryland SEA and Baltimore City LEA to discuss needed Federal supportive structures to aid coordination of basic skills programs
October	First of a series of bullets concerning basic skills coordination to be sent to program officers of programs represented on Steering Committee
	Communication Center (Clearinghouse for OE staff) for basic skills begins in Basic Skills Program Office

GOALS

March 8 and April 12, 1979, the USOE Steering Committee for Basic Skills Coordination met to finalize its plans for its activities for the balance of FY '79. These activities are aimed at:

1. Developing basic skills program coordination across the Office of Education

2. Facilitating basic skills coordination at the State level

3. Facilitating basic skills coordination at the local level

4. Facilitating basic skills coordination at the program or building level

The planned activities (see page 5) are based upon the Commissioner's Directive for the O.E. Steering Committee for Basic Skills Coordination. That document defines basic skills coordination, quotes language in various legislation that speaks of coordination, and lists possible membership on the Steering Committee. The four goals listed in the Commissioner's Directive are:

1. To define/identify what is already known about basic skills development so that programs will have a common starting place.

2. To develop an annual plan of action for the coordination of Federal basic skills programs. THIS DOCUMENT REPRESENTS THE FY'79 PLAN.

3. To direct the implementation of the plan for coordination of Federally assisted basic skills programs.

4. To assess the benefits from, the disadvantages of, and the constraints to this effort at coordination for the benefit of future coordination attempts.

RESPONSIBILITIES

The responsibilities of the Steering Committee as reflected in the Commissioner's Directive are:

1. To attend monthly meetings for communication purposes

2. To develop objectives

3. To inform and direct their individual program staffs

4. To analyze Federal laws and regulations

5. To devise common strategies

6. To develop a national Basic Skills Forum

7. To analyze State laws, plans/agreements, and programs

8. To identify promising practices

9. To provide technical assistance

10. To identify and utilize dissemination and technical assistance centers

11. To aid comprehensive statewide basic skills planning and programming

12. To aid state coordination

13. To develop an in-house O.E. Communication Center for basic skills coordination

14. To develop a glossary or catalog of basic skills terms and definitions

15. To develop case studies of basic skills coordination at the SEA level, but more particularly at the LEA level

OBJECTIVES

1. To enchance communication concerning the coordination of basic skills programs at the Federal, State, local, and program or building level.

2. To develop regulations for all affected programs that reflect coordination mandates.

3. To develop organizational supports and sanctions which encourage inter-and intra- program coordination of basic skills activities.

4. To provide Federal technical assistance to SEAs and LEAs which are attempting to coordinate basic skills activities.

5. To identify the state of the art of basic skills coordination.

6. To define appropriate alternatives at the Federal level which will help coordination at the State and local levels.

PLANNERS

The following administrative units have been identified as having major basic skills components:

- Adult Education
- Arts and Humanities
- Basic Skills (Right to Read)
- Bilingual Education
- Career Education
- Education Replication (National Diffusion Network)
- Emergency School Aid (Desegregation)
- Evaluation and Dissemination
- Follow Through
- General Counsel
- Gifted
- Grants and Contracts
- Handicapped Children
- Head Start
- Indian Education
- Institutional Development
- Libraries and Learning Resources
- National Institute of Education
- Teacher Centers
- Teacher Corps
- Title I
- Title I, Migrants
- Title IV,C,D
- Trio (Upward Bound, Talent Search, Special Services for Disadvantaged Students)
- Vocational Education

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

Five basic assumptions underlie the Steering Committee plans:

1. It is important to coordinate selected program functions across OE (a) to improve OE services to the states, the LEAs, and the learners affected by Federal funds for basic skills (b) to comply with legislated mandates.

2. Carefully designed coordination will, in fact, improve delivery of services.

3. Coordination of programs can be achieved across OE, despite past less-than-successful attempts at coordination.

4. Coordination activities demand increased staff time to initiate and maintain contacts with other units.

5. Before successful coordination can take place, there are constraints with which the policy makers and leaders of OE must deal. These are enumerated in the March 8, 1979 document.

PLANS

The following plans are coded (I) or (E). I = internal or OE (Federal) level coordination activities. E= external, or coordination activities with the field (i.e. national professional associations, SEA, LEAs, schools and programs.)

I. COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES

(I/E) A. A comparison of the laws administered by OE which involve basic skills will be developed by the Steering Committee staff by April 30, reviewed by the member programs by May 10, and printed for the members and the public by May 15, 1979. After the regulations are in final form, a similar comparison will be developed, reviewed, and made available.

The purpose of this activity will be to provide a ready reference of basic skills across programs. (The comparison was finished June 25, reviewed by August 31, and printed September 10.)

(I/E) B. Information about the Steering Committee activities will be offered regularly to the dissemination and diffusion newsletters.

The purpose of this activity is to reach a wider audience. It will commence in the Fall.

(I) C. One page bulletins will be sent to the program officers of member programs as matters of interest arise.

The purpose of this activity will be to keep the program staffs up-to-date. It will commence in the Fall.

(I) D. A communication center will be developed in the Title II Basic Skills (Right to Read) offices by 1979. This center will make information available about: (1) Materials; (2) Laws and Regulations; and (3) Funded Programs in the Basic Skills.

The purpose of this activity will be to centralize and make available to OE staff information about basic skills and coordination. Duplication of existing services such as the National Diffusion Network will be avoided. This activity will be underway by September 30, 1979.

(I) E. A staff seminar will be mounted in September for OE program officers. The goals of the seminar will be:

1. to develop a dialogue across programs;
2. to gain information about the basic skills components and the possibilities for coordination across OE programs;
3. to develop recommendations for the FY '80 Plan of the Steering Committee.

(I) F. The regional dissemination units will be explored and the information shared with the Steering Committee. The June 14 meeting will be devoted to dissemination, including:

1. An overview of the capabilities and activities of:
   a. The National Diffusion Network (NDN)
   b. The Council for Educational Development and Research (CEDAR)
   c. The regional dissemination units
   d. The dissemination work of Far West Lab
   e. Sal Rinaldi's study of technical assistance centers for the Commissioner
   f. The interagency panels on research and development of early childhood and adolescence

2. Planning for increased utility of these units by OE program officers in their work in the field, particularly as they may impact on teachers.

(I) G. An information series on specific OE programs will be explored.

The purpose of this series will be to provide crossprogram information to program officers.

(E) H. A Basic Skills Forum will be actively developed beginning with the original Basic Skills Advisory Council and including the participants of the six workshops developed under the Basic Skills Initiative, other individuals knowledgeable about basic skills coordination who are suggested by the Steering Committee, and those who ask to be included. In addition to the professional associations originally involved in the Advisory Council the Steering Committee specifically desires to include the National School Board Association.

The purposes of this activity are:

1. to identify national groups concerned with basic skills whose opinions can be solicited as key issues arise; and

2. to communicate with professional associations who can in turn communicate with their memberships about basic skills issues.

(I) I. The Steering Committee members asked to be provided with the documents developed for the 1978 Dissemination Forum:

1. Final Report

2. Dissemination Networks: information Resources for Education

3. Databases and Clearing houses: Information Resources for Education

4. Private Organization and Associations: Information Resources for Education

II. REGULATIONS ACTIVITIES

(I) A. A list of the dates for comments on new regulations will be circulated by April 20, 1979, to allow programs to coordinate regulations before they are locked into place for several years.

B. The Steering Committee recommends that P.L. 95-561, Sec. 210, be printed in all the regulations represented on the Steering Committee to overcome the lack of reciprocal coordination language in individual titles and laws. Sec. 210 says in part".. procedures for coordination between the programs assisted under this part and (specific other programs)... and other such Federal programs that support efforts to improve the basic skills of children, youth, and adults." The Steering Committee recommends that this language be interpreted broadly to include State and local programs and not narrowly to include only the Federal level. The Steering Committee requests the Commissioner to send a directive to the Executive Deputy Commissioner for Resources and Operations. to the General Counsel, and to the Director of the Division of Regulations Management directing Sec. 210 to be included in the appropriate regulations. Part of the rationale of the Steering Committee for including Sec. 210 is the concise, straight-forward language which will not add measurably to the paperload of the regulations. The final decision was to amend the EDGAR coordination sections. This was agreed upon by Policy, Regulations, General Counsel, Executive Deputy Commissioner for Educational Programs and the Steering Committee chairperson.

III. ORGANIZATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The Steering Committee recognizing that past attempts at coordination have not been too successful requests the following procedures to ensure coordination in FY' 1979:

(IL) A. That MITS concerning basic skills coordination activities be prepared across programs, especially those programs:

1. that are mandated by law to coordinate. This would require MITS for both the program with the coordination language in its law and the target program which in no case has corresponding language.

2. That have stated the intent to coordinate with specific other programs. In this case too, logic dictates that the target program will need to be included in the MITS.

(I) B. That the Deputy Commissioners assume responsibility for spotchecking the continuation of coordination activities in their Bureaus. The recommendation of the Steering Committee was that regular reporting be avoided in favor of the spotchecks. The latter were felt to yield less routinized responses from programs.

IV MONITORING ACTIVITIES

(I/E)

The Steering Committee, after identifying one to two states which have funding from all members programs, will make a joint monitoring trip to those states with the consent of their Chief State School Officers. (A model to be considered will be the New Mexico monitoring teams).

The purpose of these state program reviews will be to identify the state of the art of basic skills coordination. Nearby states will be chosen for economy's sake.

V TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES

(E) As described in the Commissioner's Directive for the OE Steering Committee for Basic Skills Coordination, appropriate representatives of member programs will provide technical assistance in teams to SEAs and LEAs which request aid in basic skills coordination. It is expected that few enough SEAs and LEAs will request technical assistance so that it will be a manageable activity. Travel funds will be provided from the Steering Committee budget except where the activity is a direct program assignment.

Technical assistance will be offered for:

1. The development of coordinated basic skills programs and activities

2. The solution of coordination problems of already existing basic skills programs.

The purpose of this activity will be:

1. To aid the field

2. To learn more about problems and appropriate Federal aid in coordination of basic skills programs.

VI CASE STUDIES

(I/E) As an extension of the technical assistance activities and of the coordination activities of the individual member programs (see VII below), six case studies at the LEA level will be done to discover the state of the art in coordination of basic skills activities and to try out various methods of aiding local schools. The Steering Committee members will implement these case studies. Possible case studies include coordination of:

1. Inservice training - Hartford, Conn. (Teacher Corps)

2. Pre-kindergarten development - Barnstable, Massachusetts

3. Secondary curriculum development- New Orleans

4. Migrants, Indians, and Bilingual- Colorado

5. Adult

6. Desegregation

VII. INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM COORDINATION PLANS

Several programs have designed coordination activities for the balance of FY'79. Each program represented in the Steering Committee has developed individual coordination plans. (See accompanying Booklet).

ASSESSMENT

A study of past efforts at coordination within education at the Federal level has uncovered very few enduring coordination practices. With the goal of ensuring that the Steering Committee's present attempt at coordination may (I) make a permanent impact and (2) set a higher baseline for future attempts at coordination, a four-year formative assessment will be designed and implemented.

While data for this assessment are already being collected in the form of a chronicle of the activities of the Steering Committee staff and members to promote coordination, the formal assessment will begin in FY'80.

The specific topics which might be studies include:

1. Coordination activities of Federal programs

2. How these coordination activities are reflected in the State, local, and program or building level counterparts of the Federal programs

3. How successfully the constraints to coordination already defined by the Steering Committee (as well as future unforeseen obstacles) are dealt with by Federal, State, and local policy makers.

4. What are the associated outcomes and costs of specific coordination activities at the Federal, State, local and program or building level? i.e., whether each coordination activity enhances the educational opportunities and achievements of individual learners of basic skills in an efficient manner.

BUDGET

The budget for the OE Steering Committee is based on the specific objectives and activities in this document and the Commissioner's Directive.

Allowable budget items will include:

I. Communication structures and materials for coordination at the Federal level

II. Seminars, conferences, and workshops for problem-solving in basic skills coordination

III. Technical assistance by the Steering Committee for Basic Skills Coordination

IV. Travel for Steering Committee activities

V. Case studies for the Steering Committee

VI. Assessment design

VII. Development and dissemination of products

Funds for these activities will be available from at least three sources:

1. Title II program funds, especially funds for Sec. 209 and 210

2. Commissioner's S & E allowance or setaside

3. Individual program funds when the assignment fits into the staff member's job descriptions in the view of his/her program manager

PROJECTED BUDGET FOR STEERING COMMITTEE
FOR BASIC SKILLS COORDINATION

(Subject to Approval)

1.	Technical assistance by Office of Education Basic Skills Steering Committee members to travel in teams to 5 sites such as State Departments of Education, regional offices, LEAs, or other promising sites	
	cost per trip 4 X $500 - $2,000 X 5 sites	$10,000
2.	State program reviews by Office of Education Basic Skills Steering Committee members to travel in teams to 2 states for review of 21 programs	
	28 members per trip X 2 sites = 56	
	cost per trip - 28 X $350 - $9,800 X 2 sites	19,600
3.	Printing and reproduction Three case studies of States Six LEA case studies Basic Skills Steering Committee Reports	5,025
4.	Clearinghouse - Communications Design and Operation	5,000
5.	OE Seminar on Basic Skills Coordination (for OE program officers, possibly consultants/CSSO) Conference site and materials	2,000
6.	Assessment design	3,000
		44,625
	Actual amount received	25,000

APPENDIX

APPENDIX
A

Problems Requiring Coordination: Reasons to Coordinate

1. Communication Problems Requiring Coordination

A. Communication between programs is a problem requiring coordination at the Federal, State, local and program levels.

B. There is a lack of knowledge of various laws and regulations at every level and no ready mechanism to gain that knowledge. Few programs officials at Federal, State, or local level can speak knowledgeably about what can or cannot be done across the laws and regulations that govern basic skills programs. Sometimes program officers are not thoroughly conversant with all aspects of the laws which even their own programs administer There are many misinterpretations of laws and regulations which hinder basic skills development and coordination.

C. Establishing and maintaining a dialogue with "external" groups who are not directed by SEA's is a problem area in coordination. Such groups include nonpublic schools and institutions of higher education which in many ways influence educational change in basic skills through their research and teacher training.

D. Communications are not reaching the teachers. Difficulties in coordination of basic skills programs at the Federal and State levels and in the 16,000 independent school districts create communication blocks with the two million teachers who often report feeling isolated in their classrooms.

II, Procedural Problems Requiring Coordination

A. Local coordination is the end goal of the Steering Committee, since that level impacts on the learner. However, many members expressed the view that the Steering Committee must make as its first goal getting its own house in order so as to act as a model of coordination and to be able to offer technical assistance to coordinating State and local programs.

B. One Steering Committee member, fresh from a meeting on the subject with Dr. Pickman, pointed out that discrepancies in the ways discretionary grants and contracts are administered is a coordination problem needing resolution.

C. It was pointed out that in addition to uneven coordination across basic skills programs, there is little coordination of program parts or Titles even within each program administered by a single manager.

D. A big problem is the development of regulations in isolation. Several representatives of member programs mentioned the regulations presently being developed by one or another Title of P.L. 95-561 which have never been offered for comment to closely allied programs. It was pointed out that regulations can allow a mechnaism for coordination where coordination exists in the law, but only if it is included and concerned programs are aware of it and involved in the regulation development to fit program strictures and to maintain program integrity.

E. Lack of coordination of technical assistance is a problem especially where the problem requiring assistance has a multi-program answer.

F. Lack of coordinated monitoring is a problem in need of coordination. Many programs have monitoring requirements which should or could include a stress on reviewing State and local coordination of programs.

G. Lack of coordinated conference attendance was mentioned as a problem by one member.

III. Date Collection Requiring Coordination

A lack of Federal forms that allow for full reporting of basic skills activities was also mentioned as a problem, since little coordination can be effected of unknown entities.

IV. The Needs of Special Groups Requiring Coordination

The needs of many groups who are served by several programs were mentioned, such as:

A. Handicapped

B. Adults

C. Bilingual children and adults

D. Migrants

E. Indians

Problems Concerning Coordination: Constraints to Coordination

Many constraints to basic skills coordination across the Office of Education were defined. It is of interest that while the concerns/ problems are real, none are beyond adjustment if coordination is seen as important enough to make the necessary changes.

I. Communication Constraints

A. Emphasis on communication with the SEA's was seen as a constraint because:

(1) so many Federally-funded educational activities are not administered through SEA's such as IHE's, non-public, direct grants to LEA's, etc.

(2) The Chief State School Officer is in the role of an envoy to the local schools because of the American philosophy of local control of schools. The CSSO in many cases has no more control of local educational coordination than does the Federal government.

B. Lack of technology to handle the information overload which stifles communication. The need of computerization of Office of Education information was seen as past due.

II. Organizational Constraints

A. There is no reward structure to encourage coordination at any level. The lack of incentives was seen as a distinct hindrance to coordination.

B. One member pointed out the difficulties of operating across bureaus in addition to inter-program coordination problems

C. The coming changovers in OE administration with the announcement of:

(1) Commissioner Boyer's resignation

(2) a proposed reorganization

(3) a possible Education Department

were mentioned by several members as deterrents to planning and implementing coordination. Several examples were mentioned of past (needed) initiatives which came and went before solid gains could be accomplished.

D. There is no internal S & E in many programs to allow for needed technical assistance to States and local agencies desiring to coordinate basic skills programs. Even internal funds for handbooks on coordination were seen as problematic in at least one program.

E. The fear of loss of revenue and staff time was seen as a constraint to coordination at all levels. The example of individual children being double - or quadruple - counted for various Federally - funded programs at the program level was cited Would coordination eliminate this practice and therefore school revenue? Even at the Federal level the fear that coordination of funds and staffs could raid basic skills program resources is a constraint. As one member pointed out, "To coordinate, someone has to give up something, if it is only time."

F. There is no staff time to coordinate. Most people work full-time at the work assigned to them within their programs. It is difficult to find "volunteer" time to attend to added functions.

G. Coordination activities are not included in job descriptions of general program staff, Neither are coordination activities included ir the job descriptions of the Steering Committee members.

H. Steering Committee members do not have the authority to plan for the program managers and program staffs they represent.

I. There is a confusion between Title II program duties and Steering Committee duties. The Steering Committee preceded the legislation and it is often difficult to keep responsibilities delineated. For example, the Steering Committee is pondering its posture regarding the State agreements under Sec. 222 and 224 of P.L. 95-561. Since comprehensive educational planning is mandated, it seems obvious that the member programs (especially their managers) should be involved at as early a point as possible. However, the Title II draft regulations do not relate Sec. 210 (the Steering Committee) to Sec. 222 and 224 to allow a mechanism for offering information and aid as needed by the States.

J. There is a confusion about who has responsibility at the local level when coordination takes place. An example was given of a Title I coordinator, a IV C coordinator, and a coordinator for handicapped children having rule confusion in a coordinated program.

III. Legal Constraints

A. Laws do not legislate coordination in both directions in most cases. For example, Bilingual is mandated by law to coordinate with ESAA, but ESAA is not mandated to coordinate with Bilingual. Therefore coordination is not likely to be in ESAA regulations or staff job descriptions.

B. There is little or no available sanction in formula grant programs to insure coordination in States and local programs.

C. There are conflicts between administrative and legislative laws concerning program activities. For example, a coordination activity designed by program staff might be vetoed by Contracts and Grants.

D. The States sometimes add restrictions to the administration of Federal funds which throw further roadblocks before basic skills programs coordination.

E. Differences in definitions of target groups may bar educational services from individual students. For example, both Follow Through and Title I serve low-income children. However, Title I children are also defined by achievement level --those operating below the 50th percentile are served. It was reported that in some programs when the child taught by the Follow Through/Title I teacher reaches the 50th percentile, the student loses all services, although Follow Through services should continue.

IV. Constraints from Lack of Data Concerning Basic Skills

Both Title IV and Community Education report that through they are allowed to fund basic skills activities by law, they have been restrained in the past by OMB from collecting data on basic skills involvement of individual projects. These data collection restrictions leave them in the dark as to the extent and kind of basic skills activities they fund which might be coordinated with other OE basic skills efforts.

V. Constraints from Differing Definitions of Basic Skills

An on-going hindrance to basic skills coordination is varying definitions of basic skills, either assumed or articulated. Individual programs, States, professional associations, and sectors within the general public have different definitions which affect programs decisions and coordination practices.

Matrix of Basic Skills Coordination-Related Problems

Problem Area	Problem Requiring Coordination	Constraints to Coordination
Procedures	1. Local coordination 2. Discrepancies in discretionary grant management 3. Lack of coordination of individual program parts at the Federal level 4. Regulations development in isolation 5. Lack of coordinated technical assistance 6. Lack of coordinated monitoring 7. Lack of coordinated conference going	1. Conflicts between legislated and administrated law in what can be done 2. State-added restrictions
Laws		1. Difference in definition of target groups that block services to individual students 2. No sanctions in block grants to enforce coordination at SEA and LEA levels 3. Laws do not legislate coordination in both directions, so coordination is not in regulations or job descriptions of one of affected programs
Communications	1. Communications at all levels 2. Lack of knowledge of various laws and regulations--what each program can or can't do. Allows for misinterpretations 3. Dialogue with "external" groups such as IHE's, professional associations, nonpublic which are part of the problem/solution in basic skills development 4. Communications don't get to the teachers	1. Lack of technology to handle information overload which stifles communication. Should not be done by hand and by personal contact. 2. Communication only with SEA's despite local control of LEA (including testing, direct grants, nonpublic schools, IHE, nonprofit agencies)

Problem Area	Problems Requiring Coordination	Constraints to Coordination
Organization		1. No reward structures for coordination 2. Hindrances to working across bureaus 3. Changeovers of administration 4. No internal S&E for technical assistance and handbooks 5. Fear of loss of revenue and staff time at all levels 6. No staff time for coordination 7. Coordination is not in job descriptions of Steering Committee members or general program staff 8. Steering Committee members do not have the authority to plan for their program managers and staff 9. Confusion between Title II program duties and Steering Committee duties 10. Confusion of responsibilities of program personnel at local level when coordinated
Special Groups	1. Handicapped 2. Adults 3. Bilingual children and adults 4. Migrants 5. Indians	
Data	Federal reporting formats which are not designed to collect needed information on basic skills and coordination	Restrictions that do not allow data collection on basic skills services allowed by law (example, IV C and Community Education)
Definitions	Lack of a determination of varying definitions of basic skills held by different groups	Federal laws and policy decisions State and local laws and policy decisions public and nonprofessional belief systems

Department of Education

Steering Committee

For

Basic Skills Coordination

November 5, 1979

FY 1980 PLAN

Shirley A. Jackson
Chairperson
Room 1167, Donohoe
245-8537

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

Time Line.....1

Introduction.....2

Goals.....2

Responsibilities.....2

Basic Assumptions.....3

Planners.....4

1980 Objectives.....4

1980 Plans.....5

1. Monthly Meetings.....5
2. Inform and Direct Individual Program Staffs.....5
3. Analyze Federal Laws.....6
4. Devise Common Strategies.....6
5. Develop a National Forum.....7
6. Analyze State Laws.....7
7. Identify Promising Practices.....8
8. Provide Technical Assistance.....8
9. Technical Assistance Centers.....8
10. Case Studies.....9
11. Statewide Basic Skills Planning.....9
12. Aid State and Local Coordination.....9
13. Central Communication Center.....9
14. Develop a Glossary.....11
15. Develop Assessment Plan.....11

Budget.....12

Introduction

June 6, 1979, the then U.S. Commissioner of Education, Ernest L. Boyer, signed a Directive outlining the responsibilities of the O.E. Steering Committee for Basic Skills Coordination. That Directive calls for an Annual Plan based upon the Directive. This document represents the FY 1980 Plan of the Steering Committee.

Goals

The primary goals of the Steering Committee are:

1. To define/identify what is already known about basic skills development so that the programs will have a common starting place.

2. To develop a plan by November 30 each year to effect coordination of basic skills programs at the Federal level and to aid the coordination of programs at the State and local levels.

3. To direct the implementation of the plan of coordination of basic skills programs.

4. To assess the process of and the results of these coordination efforts so that future activities may have a higher baseline from which to start.

Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Steering Committee members as reflected in the Commissioner's Directive are:

1. To attend monthly meetings for communication purposes

2. To develop objectives

3. To inform and direct their individual program staffs

4. To analyze Federal laws and regulations

5. To devise common strategies for coordination of basic skills activities

6. To develop a national Basic Skills Forum

7. To analyze State laws, plans/agreements, and programs

8. To identify promising practices

9. To provide technical assistance

10. To identify and utilize dissemination and technical assistance centers

11. To aid comprehensive statewide basic skills planning and programming

12. To aid State coordination of Federal, State, and locally-funded basic skills activities

13. To develop an in-house Department of Education Communication Center for basic skills coordination

14. To develop a glossary or catalog of basic skills terms and definitions

15. To develop case studies of basic skills coordination at the SEA level, but more particularly at the LEA level

Basic Assumptions

Six basic assumptions underlie the Steering Committee plans:

1. It is important to coordinate selected basic skills program functions across the Department of Education (a) to improve services to the States, the LEAs, and the learners affected by Federal funds for basic skills (b) to comply with legislated mandates to coordinate.

2. Carefully designed coordination will, in fact, improve the delivery of services.

3. Coordination of programs can be achieved across the Department of Education, despite past less-than-successful attempts at coordination.

4. Coordination activities demand increased staff time to initiate and maintain contacts with other units.

5. Before successful coordination can take place, there are constraints with which the policy makers and leaders of the Department of Education must deal.

6. To coordinate, staffs must (a) know each other's programs, (b) plan together, (c) act together, (d) give feedback to each other.

Planners

The following administrative units have been identified as having major basic skills components:

- Adult Education
- Arts and Humanities
- Basic Skills (Right to Read)
- Bilingual Education
- Career Education
- Education Replication (National Diffusion Network)
- Emergency School Aid (Desegregation)
- Evaluation and Dissemination
- Follow Through
- General Counsel
- Gifted
- Grants and Contracts
- Handicapped Children
- Head Start
- Indian Education
- Institutional Development
- Libraries and Learning Resources
- National Institute of Education
- Teacher Corps
- Teacher Centers
- Title I
- Title I, Migrants
- Title IV, C,D
- TRIO (Upward Bound, Talent Search, Special Services for Disadvantaged Students)
- Vocational Education

1980 Objectives

1. To enhance communication concerning the coordination of basic skills programs at the Federal, State, local, and program or building level.

2. To clarify the potential areas of coordination of programs through the continued study of the basic skills-related legislation and regulations at the Federal and State levels.

3. To aid the coordination of staff development in the areas of basic skills and program coordination at all levels of education.

4. To promote both the substance of basic skills and the administration of basic skills coordination through the study of promising practices and through case studies.

5. To provide technical assistance in basic skills coordination to all levels of education through a Handbook and a trained cadre of Department of Education basic skills coordination specialists.

6. To enhance basic skills coordination at the Federal, State, and local levels through individual program plans at the Federal level which include activities at the State and local levels.

1980 Plans

1. Monthly Meetings. The working representatives of the twenty-five programs and offices represented on the Steering Committee will meet from 9:30 - 12:00 the second Thursday of each month. The program directors and deputy commissioners of those programs will meet with their working representatives in full Steering Committee sessions the second Thursdays of March and September, (March 13 and September 11, 1980).

2. Inform and Direct Individual Program Staffs. The working representatives will design, under the direction of their managers and the deputy commissioners of their bureaus, an on-going internal communication strategy for their branches, divisions, and programs which have basic skills components. The purposes of the internal communication strategy will be:

   (a) to inform the program staff and supervisors of Steering Committee activities;
   (b) to share among staff members the basic skills activities within their own program;
   (c) to inform staff members about the basic skills activities of other programs;
   (d) to share specific coordination strategies and methodology;
   (e) to gather information for the Steering Committee about possibilities for and blockages to coordination at the Federal, State, local, and instructional building levels as it relates to that program.

   In brief, the purposes of the internal communication structure will be: to inform; to gather information and suggestions; to trouble-shoot coordination problems; and possibly for staff development.

Each working representative will arrange a specific time each month to be briefed by and to brief his/her program manager about basic skills coordination.

Member programs will work on putting basic skills coordination into job descriptions so that their staffs will have the time and get the credit for this important work. The job descriptions will relate basic skills coordination to the daily lives of program officers and decision-makers.

Individual program plans for basic skills coordination will be developed in detail, including: reasons for coordination; time lines; who will take responsibility and be involved; and anticipated outcomes.

Each program should develop its own strategy for implementing the EDGAR 580, 581 language, including in their regulations development, application review process, monitoring, technical assistance, and reporting.

3. Analyze Federal Laws. The Steering Committee staff will compare the Federal regulations, as soon as those regulations are in final form, using the same variables as the Comparison of Legislation.

   A study of the overlap and conflicts in authorized basic skills activities will be completed. How the legislation fits together to serve the needs of all age groups will be studied to isolate unmet needs.

   The working representative in each program will be responsible for keeping current about the overlap and conflicts of that program with other programs and for keeping the manager informed.

   An in-depth look at the laws and regulations of specific programs will be dealt with as part of the monthly meetings.

4. Devise Common Strategies. The Steering Committee has decided to concentrate in 1980 on the coordination of staff development. Staff development in the basic skills and coordination will be planned and implemented for all levels of staff from the Department of Education to local schools.

   The Steering Committee will work closely with the Horace Mann Learning Center in planning and implementing the Department of Education part of the staff development. This part

will try to take into account the training needs in basic skills and coordination of:

(a) branch and section chiefs
(b) new program officers
(c) experienced program officers
(d) repetition of sessions to allow for new and/or traveling program staff.
(e) regional staff

The strategies for coordinating pre- and inservice staff development in the areas of basic skills and coordination at the State, local, and instructional building levels will need to be worked out program by program by the working representatives and their managers. This part of the staff development in basic skills coordination will try to take into account the training needs of:

(a) State staffs
(b) Central LEA staffs
(c) principals
(d) teachers
(e) project staffs

In addition, the Steering Committee discussed the development of a series of lunchtime information seminars on the basic skills activities of specific programs in the Department of Education.

5. Develop a National Forum for Basic Skills. The Steering Committee has decided to approach the National Forum as a developmental activity for 1980. The member programs will begin to develop a common list of persons knowledgeable about basic skills coordination. In 1981 opinions will be elicited from and basic skills coordination activities at the Federal level will be communicated to this Forum.

6. Analyze State Laws, Plans/Agreements, and Programs. The Steering Committee staff will continue to clear the necessary forms through FEDAC to implement the process that the Regional Commissioners for Educational Programs and the Steering Committee Chairperson have worked out. (The forms have been in FEDAC since March 5, 1979). Regional staffs will collect and compile State laws, guidelines, State board orders, and State plans/agreements which pertain to basic skills improvement and coordination.

The Steering Committee also wishes to encourage the development of State Directories of Basic Skills Activities within the States. The suggestion was made that State Basic Skills Coordinators be urged to do this.

7. Identify Promising Practices. The Regional Commissioners for Educational Programs will locate, describe, and disseminate promising practices in basic skills improvement and coordination at the State and local levels. In addition, the NIE representatives on the Steering Committee will continue to be active in this area.

8. Provide Technical Assistance in Basic Skills Coordination. As a result of many recommendations, the Steering Committee will produce a Handbook on Coordination as its main technical assistance activity for 1980. This Handbook will:

   (a) offer practical detailed examples of coordination practices in each of the general areas of coordination outlined in EDGAR.
   (b) offer a basic procedural model of coordination.
   (c) contain a matrix of staff/methods of coordination.
   (d) consider the various levels of coordination--Federal, State, local, and instructional building.

   In the development of that Handbook, the Steering Committee will engage in two fact-finding trips to nearby States:

   (a) A trip to Richmond to discuss needed Federal support structures for basic skills coordination with the Virginia SEA, the Richmond LEA, and a school faculty.

   The Steering Committee will attend a briefing session with program officers from their programs who have the Richmond area in their assignment.

   (b) A return trip in September, 1980, to the Maryland SEA and the Baltimore City Public Schools to discuss progress in and examples of coordination over the year and gain additional information for needed support.

   As a separate technical assistance activity, the training of a Department of Education cadre of basic skills coordination specialists may begin.

9. Identify, Coordinate and Utilize Dissemination and Technical Assistance Centers. The Steering Committee will cooperate with the efforts in this area both in the Regional Liaison Office and the Office of the Executive Deputy Commissioner for Resources and Operations. The Steering Committee will also approach this activity through the Central Communication Center (see No. 13 below).

10. Develop Coordinated Case Studies. Self-selected member programs will volunteer to engage in limited projects with SEAs and LEAs in common areas of development or problem areas to demonstrate ways the Department of Education can collaborate in basic skills coordination and to define the present state of the art in basic skills coordination in the SEA's and LEA's.

    These case studies will be reported to and disseminated by the Steering Committee.

11. Aid Comprehensive Statewide Basic Skills Planning. Individual Steering Committee members will continue to aid in the review of the drafts of the State Comprehensive Agreements on Basic Skills required under ESEA, Title II. Those plans are expected to be completed in 1980 and to be four-year agreements.

12. Aid State and Local Coordination. The member programs will set a schedule with their program staffs to work with their State and discretionary counterparts to insure statewide coordination of basic skills activities according to the strategy devised for implementing the EDGAR language. Each manager is urged to inform his/her constituencies at the State and local levels that, wherever feasible, coordination with other basic skills activities is a priority in his/her program as well as in the Department of Education.

13. Develop a Central Communication Center for Coordination of Basic Skills. A central Department of Education communication center will be established in the Basic Skills Program (Title II) for the purpose of information sharing in basic skills and coordination within the Department of Education staff.

    The Far West Lab has a small contract with the Steering Committee to design an internally-run Information Center on Basic Skills Coordination for the use of the Department of Education staff.

The plan envisioned for the clearinghouse/brokerage is one which will have the goals of:

(a) Allowing timely access to, while avoiding duplication with, existing networks and information sources for the basic skills in the Department of Education or elsewhere.

(b) Filling in the gaps through limited collection building in the areas of basic skills and of coordination.
(c) Developing necessary technical assistance/training materials to aid Federal professional staff in facilitating true program coordination at all levels of education within the constraints of the varying legislation and regulations.

Tasks

Develop an operating plan for a clearinghouse/brokerage which includes:

(a) Economical strategies (in terms of money and staff time) for gaining access to existing information sources.
(b) A collection of basic skills teaching/learning information (materials, processes, and resource people) within and without the Department of Education.

(1) of interest to Department of Education staff and
(2) not readily available from No. 1 above;

(c) A collection of information on coordination of programs at all levels of education

(1) of interest to Department of Education staff and
(2) not readily available from No. 1 above.

(d) Strategies for gaining access to professional staff within and outside of Department of Education with similar assignments in different programs (the similarity might be the area of specialization, geographic assignments, etc.).

(e) The preparation of special materials to aid the Department of Education program officers and managers in working with State departments of education and local education agencies in the coordination of basic skills programs.

(f) One consideration will be that all the information be put on computer (a) for quick retrieval and (b) to aid in keeping it current.

14. Develop a Glossary or Catalog of Terms. The NIE Division of Dissemination and the Improvement of Practice is working with the Steering Committee on synthesizing the range of views, opinions, and definitions of basic skills presently held in the United States and the resulting modes of instruction. The Steering Committee will continue to cooperate with NIE toward the projected February, 1980, completion date of this project.

15. Develop an assessment plan for Federal coordination efforts. A study of past efforts at coordination within education at the Federal level has uncovered very few enduring coordination practices. With the goal of ensuring that the Steering Committee's present attempt at coordination may (1) make a permanent impact and (2) set a higher baseline for future attempts at coordination, a four-year formative assessment will be designed and implemented.

    While data for this assessment are already being collected in the form of a chronicle of the activities of the Steering Committee staff and members to promote coordination, the formal assessment will begin in FY'80.

    The specific topics which might be studies include:

    (a) Coordination activities of Federal programs.
    (b) How these coordination activities are reflected in the State, local, and program or building level counterparts of the Federal programs.
    (c) How successfully the constraints to coordination already defined by the Steering Committee (as well as future unforeseen obstacles) are dealt with by Federal, State, and local policy makers.
    (d) The associated outcomes and costs of specific coordination activities at the Federal, State, local and program or building levels, i.e., whether each coordination activity enhances the educational opportunities and achievements of individual learners of basic skills in an efficient manner. How to measure coordination activities will be studied.

Proposed Budget

1.	Handbook on Coordination to aid technical assistance of the Department of Education staffs.	$10,000
2.	State/Local/Instructional Building fact-finding trips to Virginia and Maryland by Steering Committee.	$8,500
3.	Printing and Reproduction of three case studies.	$3,000
4.	Support for Case Studies	$2,000
5.	Seminars/Conferences on Basic Skills Coordination	$4,000
6.	Information Center (Clearinghouse) on Basic Skills Coordination	$17,125
7.	Assessment design	$15,000
		$59,625